



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,569	05/25/2000	Kiyonori Sekiguchi	P19529	6332

7055 7590 06/16/2003

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

6

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,569

Applicant(s)

SEKIGUCHI, KIYONORI

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3, 4
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.
2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. The following phrase renders the claims indefinite:
 - i. ...according claim 1, - claim 7, line 1. (i.e. according to claim 1, the word "to" is missing).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Akatsu et al (hereinafter Akatsu), US 6,496,862.

6. As per claims 1 and 10, Akatsu taught the claimed invention including a gateway apparatus capable of connecting to the internet, said apparatus being one of components constructing a home network (col.6, lines 33-58), said apparatus comprising:

- a. An IP address table that relates a plurality of apparatuses, each of which is one of the components constructing the home network, to IP addresses respectively assigned to the apparatuses to store (col.9, lines 2-17);
- b. A reception section that is configured to receive data with a destination indicative of one of the apparatuses construction the home network (col.9, lines 30-31, 33);
- c. A recognition section that is configured to recognize the apparatus with an IP address matching the IP address indicative of the destination contained in received data using the IP address table (col.9, lines 33, 54-59); and
- d. A distribution section that is configured to transmit the received data to a recognized apparatus (col.9, lines 60-64).

Art Unit: 2154

7. As per claim 4, Akatsu taught the invention as claimed in claim 1. Akatsu further taught that the apparatuses constructing the home network include an apparatus that has a function of directly accessing to the Internet to communicate (col.6, lines 45) and an apparatus that does not have the function of directly accessing to the Internet to communicate (col.6, lines 43-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5-9, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akatsu, US 6,496,862.

10. As per claim 5, Akatsu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4. Akatsu further taught that the apparatus that does not have the function of directly accessing to the Internet to communicate includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a printer, a television and a digital camera (col.6, lines 43-46). Akatsu did not specifically teach that the group also consisting of a scanner, a refrigerator, a hot-water supply, an electric power meter, and a tap water meter. However, it is a design choice for the homeowner to include different apparatuses in the home network including but not limited to the listed group. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply

different apparatus that does not have direct internet access function to Akatsu's home network according to one's need or desire.

11. As per claim 6, Akatsu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Akatsu did not specifically teach to include a security system that is configured to exclude an incorrect use by performing password check to an access through the Internet. However, the use of password and login id is well known in the art to provide basic security check. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide security system to perform password check to Akatsu's home network system to prevent unauthorized user, such as children or guest of home, for accessing the apparatuses in the home network.

12. As per claim 7, Akatsu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Akatsu further taught a computer directly or indirectly connected to the gateway apparatus (col.6, lines 45). Akatsu did not specifically teach the computer to write IP addresses of the apparatuses in the IP address table. However, using a computer to modify address table or configuration is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a computer for configuring, editing, updating and creating IP address table or other files in Akatsu's home network system as the administrator's system to provide network management.

Art Unit: 2154

13. As per claim 8, Akatsu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Akatsu did not specifically teach to include converters provided for each apparatus on the home network configured to convert the received data into data that the apparatus as the destination of the received data is capable of processing. However, Akatsu taught to transform the format of the received data before it is transmitted to the apparatus (col.9, lines 33-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the step of reformatting the data taught by Akatsu can be used to replace the claimed converters and eliminates the need of having multiple converters provide for each apparatus and the need of specifying a converter.

14. As per claims 9 and 11, Akatsu taught the claimed invention including a gateway apparatus capable of connecting to the internet, said apparatus being one of components constructing a home network (col.6, lines 33-58), said apparatus comprising:

- a. A recognition section that is configured to recognize a apparatus X as an originator issuing transmission data, and a destination indicative of a reception terminal to receive the transmission data (col.6, lines 47-50, col.9, lines 33, 54-59);
- b. A reception section that is configured to receive the transmission data through the home network from the apparatus X as the originator after the apparatus as the originator and the destination indicative of the reception terminal are recognize (col.9, lines 30-31, 33); and

- c. A communication section that is configured to convert received transmission data into an Internet frame to transmit to the destination indicative of the reception terminal (col.6, lines 63-67, col.9, lines 54-59).

15. Akatsu did not specifically teach that apparatus X is a non-IP apparatus from among apparatuses on the home network transmitting data by an instruction from an IP apparatus on the home network. However, having an apparatus to send command to instruct or control other apparatuses that are non-IP apparatuses to perform actions is well known in the art. For example, home network administrator computer is able to send command to a coffee machine to start cooking coffee, or instructing a facsimile machine to transmit fax to others. Akatsu further taught that the non-IP apparatus does not have a function of directly accessing to the Internet to communicate but the IP apparatus has (col.6, lines 43-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an apparatus for administering, monitoring and operating the non-IP apparatuses among the same network by sending commands in Akatsu's home network system to provide total control of the non-IP apparatuses from one specific administrator apparatus.

16. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akatsu, US 6,496,862, in view of Hamamoto et al (hereinafter Hamamoto), US 6,038,233.

17. As per claim 2, Akatsu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Akatsu did not specifically teach the gateway to further comprise a conversion section that is configured

to execute processing for converting a type of IP address indicative of the destination contained in the received data into a type of an IP address registered in the IP address table when the type of the IP address indicative of the destination is different from the type of the IP address registered in the IP address table. However, Akatsu taught to use the address mapping table to find the correct address information for the destination node (col.9, lines 54-59). Hamamoto taught a translator for converting IP address indicative of the destination contained in the received data into an IP address registered in the IP address table (col.4, lines 6-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Akatsu and Hamamoto because Hamamoto's teaching of translating different types of IP address enables to a type of IP address used in the home network system enables apparatuses with incompatible IP address to transmit/receive data with the apparatuses in the Akatsu's home network through the gateway.

18. As per claim 3, Akatsu and Hamamoto taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Hamamoto further taught that the type of the IP address indicative of the destination is IPv6, and the type of the IP address registered in the IP address table is IPv4 (abstract, col.8, lines 30-39, 50-59).

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Krishnan, US 6,157,950, disclosed methods for using one IP in home network.

Art Unit: 2154

Schindler et al, US 5,675,390, disclosed home entertainment system with display.

Freadman, US 5,722,041, disclosed hybrid home entertainment system.

Humpleman, US 6,005,861, disclosed home multimedia network.

Aravamudan et al, US 6,006,272, disclosed IP translating.

Lee et al, US 6,535,493, disclosed home and remote network support for mobile unit.

Edson, US 6,526,581, disclosed home network utilizing a gateway.

20. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703)305-9678. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:


Official Responses: (703) 746-7239

After Final Responses: (703) 746-7238

Draft Responses: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-6121.

ksl
June 12, 2003


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER